REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were examined in the Final office action mailed on 02/15/2007 (hereafter "First Final Office Action". All claims were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application 5,701,480 naming as inventor Raz (hereafter "Raz").

By virtue of this amendment, claims 1, 7, 10, and 16 are sought to be amended, and claims 22-24 are sought to be added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested further in view of the below remarks.

Telephone Interview

As noted above, a telephone interview was conducted with Examiners Pannala and Sanders on 16 May 2007. Only the undersigned representative and the two Examiners are believed to be the participants.

The undersigned representative noted the differences of the subject matter of the present application from the teachings of Raz along the lines noted in the remarks section below. The Examiners suggested that the claims be amended further to reflect the differences.

The applicant is believed to have met the burden of making of record the Substance of the Interview. The Examiner is respectfully requested to send a duly completed Interview Summary form PTOL 413 if one has not been sent already. See MPEP 713.04 for further clarification.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Raz. The rejection is rendered moot at least in view of the foregoing amendments, as explained below.

For example, currently amended independent claim 1 recites, "... wherein said

program logic is contained in a user program designed by a programmer; ...   specifying in said program logic a plurality of combinations for execution in a sequential order, wherein each of said plurality of combinations contains ... a rollback procedure ...   designed to rollback said task procedure".

5   The claimed user programs are akin to application program 90 of Raz, as will be apparent to a skilled practitioner by reading the disclosure of the subject application.

          Application program 90 of Raz does not appear specify the claimed combinations including a rollback procedure. The rollback procedures of Raz appear to be the same for all
10   application programs, at least based on the below:

> Turning now to FIG. 5A, there is shown a block diagram of the programming and data structures used in the digital computer 20 of FIG. 1. for scheduling transactions and enforcing global transaction commitment ordering. ***Global and local transactions are initiated, for example, by application programs 90. To commit the results of transactions to state memory 28, 29 and to recover from failures, the digital computer is provided with a resource manager (RM) 91 that, for example, performs the operations shown in FIG. 3.*** The resource manager 91, for example, also manages a transaction list (TL) 93 as further described below with reference to FIG. 6. ***In general, a resource manager (RM) is a software component that manages state memory resources affected by committing transactions in such a way that the memory state of the resources can be restored before the transaction is committed by effectively undoing all of the changes introduced by the transaction.*** (Col. 18, Lines 14-30 of Raz, ***Emphasis Added***)

25   Accordingly it is Applicants' position that Raj does not teach or reasonably suggest several features of currently amended claim 1.

          Thus currently amended claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Raj. Claims 2-6 and 22 depend from claim 1, and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to currently amended claim 1.

30   Dependent claim 22 is allowable for additional reasons in reciting that, "wherein different user programs contain different rollback procedures ...   for execution in said system".

Currently amended independent claim 7 is allowable over Raz at least in reciting that, "... , wherein each of said plurality of combinations is received from a corresponding user program and wherein the roll back procedure received from a first user program is different from the roll back procedure received from a second user program".

5   At least for reasons noted above, Raz does not clearly teach different rollback procedures in different user programs, and thus amended claim 7 is allowable over Raz. Claims 8, 9 and 23 depend from claim 7, are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to currently amended claim 7.

Currently amended independent claim 10 is allowable over Raz in reciting, "receiving
10   a plurality of combinations for execution, ... wherein each of said plurality of combinations is received from a corresponding user program and wherein the roll back procedure received from a first user program is different from the roll back procedure received from a second user program", at least for reasons similar to those noted above.

Claims 11-15 depend from claim 10, and are allowable at least for the reasons noted
15   above with respect to currently amended claim 10.

Currently amended independent claim 16 is allowable over Raz in reciting that, "... wherein said program logic is contained in a user program designed by a programmer" at least for some of the reasons noted above.

Claims 17-21 and 23 depend from claim 16, and are allowable at least for the reasons
20   noted above with respect to currently amended claim 16.

Conclusion

Thus, it is believed that all rejections have been overcome. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the final rejection and continue examination. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is
25   believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/
Signature
Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number: 41,416

Date: June 5, 2007